

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,078 09/21/2001 7590 02/17/2005		Michal Lemaire	DN2001165USA	4361	
			EXAM	INER	
Howard M. Cohn			KNABLE, GEOFFREY L		
c/o Ronald P. Yaist, Dept 823 The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1144 East Market Street			1733		
Akron, OH 44316-0001			DATE MAILED: 02/17/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/960,078	LEMAIRE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Geoffrey L. Knable	1733		

	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Geoffrey L. Knable	1733					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE	HE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. 🗵	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) b)	To the second se							
ceen CFR above earne	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Attensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have seen filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 FR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) soove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). OTICE OF APPEAL							
2. <u> </u>	The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). MENDMENTS							
3. 🗵	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for				
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.					
, _—	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1] The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		omphant Amenamen	(1 102 02 1).				
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	nent canceling				
7. 🔀	the non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
	Claim(s) allowed: <u>8-10,21-24 and 30-32</u> . Claim(s) objected to:							
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,4-7 and 25-29</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
	 The request for reconsideration has been consider because: 	lered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition fo	r allowance				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)								
	☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.			the				
			Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1733					

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20050215

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the language proposed to be added to claim 25 rasies new issues requring further consdieration and/or search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: principally the reasons of record. With respect to the pair of rollers, applicant points out distinctions between the devices of the secondary references and the primary reference. It however is still considered that these secondary references amply establish that the artisan desiring to achieve rolling guidance with respect to a v-shaped rail, would have expected and found it obvious to provide a pair of rollers as a suitable and effective substitute for single grooved roller for only the expected results. The arguments with respect to claims 25 pertain to the features noted above to require further consideration. .

Continuation of 13. Other: The 7-19-2004 IDS still fails to comply for the same reasons set forth in the final rejection. Further, contrary to applicant's arguments, all the cited references were not in the English language - note EP '165. Also, although applicant refers to a copy of the EP search report as being attached, no such paper was received. Further, as noted in the final rejection, "the date of any resubmission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) w be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filling the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 C(1).".